



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	Fi	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,775	06/18/2001		Thanh T. Tran	1981-00700 JMH	2993
23505	7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
CONLEY	ROSE, P.	C.	SHANG, ANNAN Q		
P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
110 COSTON, 111 77223 5207				2617	
				DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action C	09/883,775	TRAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Annan Q. Shang	2617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONEI	tely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18	<u>June 2001</u> .					
	is action is non-final.					
	·					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	ccepted or b) objected to by the E e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prince application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Ints have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/18/01. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/883,775

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 and 3-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goddard (6,684,240)** in view of **Zigmond et al (6,571,392)**.

As to claim 1, note the **Goddard** reference figures 1-2 and 6, discloses an information appliance implementing content control systems and further discloses a set top box (STB 200, fig. 2):

a host system (Processing System 602/Mem-604/AuxMem-605/NetInt-606/AuxProS-608/DisplaySys-612 'ProSystem' 602-612, fig. 6 and col. 12, lines 26-52);

a universal control logic (Input/Output System 'I/O-S' 616, which interfaces to devices and other user controls via Control Panel 202, col. 13, line 51-col. 14, line 1+) coupled to the host system (ProSystem 602-608) via bus (System bus 'Bus' 610), note that I/O-S-616 also comprises one or more controllers or adapters (col. 13, lines 51-54);

a plurality of input controls (I/O Device1-N 'I/O-D1-N,' col. 13, lines 34-37, line 54-col. 14, line 3 and Control Panel 'CP' 202 of fig. 2, col. 5, lines 17-33) coupled to the universal control logic (I/O-S-616), note that I/O-D1-N RF communication adapters, keyboard, mouse, touchpad, touch screen, etc.; and

a display (Display 'DS' 614, col. col. 13, lines 33-41) coupled to the universal control logic (I/O-S-616); and the universal control logic (I/O-S-616), the input controls (I/O-D1-N) and the display (DS 612/614) are located outside the shielded enclosure (col. 5, lines 21-29);

where the host system (ProSystem 602-612) transmits data over Bus 610 to universal control logic (I/O-S-616) and the universal control logic and the universal control logic provides the data to the display to be shown to a user (col. 4, lines 31-65, col. 5, lines 57-64, col. 12, lines 61 and col. 13, lines 38-col. 14, line 3).

Goddard fails to explicitly teach where the host system or ProSystem 602-612 is contained within a shielded enclosure.

However, note the **Zigmond** reference figures 1, 4 and 7 discloses TV receiver or set top receiver 201, where the host system is a personal computer 'PC' 720 contained within a shielded enclosure with various controls and displays outside the PC (col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 5 and col. 11, lines 24-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Zigmond into the system of Goddard to provide a shielded enclosure to protect the various processing components of the receiver.

As to claim 3, Goddard further discloses where the universal control logic comprises a hub, bus interface and a microcontroller, the bus interface coupled to the hub and the controller (col. 13, line 51-col. 14, line 3).

Application/Control Number: 09/883,775

Art Unit: 2617

As to claim, Goddard further discloses where the bus comprises a universal serial bus (col. 12, lines 45-61).

As to claim 5, Goddard further discloses where a communication unit coupled to the universal control logic, which sends and receives information between the STB and other devices (col. 12, lines 13-20 and col. 13, lines 51+).

As to claim 6, Goddard further discloses where the communication unit comprises an antenna and transceiver, and where the transceiver is coupled to the antenna and the universal control logic (col. 12, lines 13-20 and col. 13, lines 51+).

As to claims 7-8, Goddard further discloses where the microcontroller includes a status flag bit associated with each input control, and the microcontroller sets a status flag when the associated input control is activated and where the universal control includes an interrupt bit that in polled by the host system over the bus (col. 12, lines 40-67 and col. 13, line 51-col. 14, line 3).

As to claims 9-10, the claimed "an electronics devices, comprising..." is composed of the same structural elements as previously rejected claim 1.

Claims 11-12 are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 7-8.

As to claim 13, Goddard further discloses where the host system sends commands to the universal control logic (UCL) over the bus and the commands include a command identifier, and the UCL reads the command identifier to determine the type of command (col. 12, lines 40-67 and col. 13, line 51-col. 14, line 3).

As to claim 14, Goddard further discloses where the command identifier comprises a command selected from the group consisting of a request for universal

control logic to indicate the status of input controls and a command for the UCL to show information on the display (col. 12, lines 40-67 and col. 13, line 51-col. 14, line 3).

Page 5

As to claim 15, Goddard further discloses where the inputs controls, includes a volume control providing digital inputs to the UCL (col. 5, lines 15-25).

As to claim 16, Goddard further discloses where the host system (ProSystem 602-612) includes interfaces to a speaker and a television monitor, where the host system responds to an activation of the volume control by changing the volume level provided to the speaker (col. 12, lines 26-50 and col. 13, line 51-col. 14, line 3).

4. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (6,684,240) in view of Zigmond et al (6,571,392) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Li et al (6,026,168).

As to claim 2, Goddard as modified by Zigmond, teach where the input controls, includes a digital volume, but fail to explicitly teach a digital volume knob.

However, note the **Li** reference figure 11 discloses a signal regulator for audio/video receiver and further discloses a digital volume knob 180 (col. 12, lines 11-48.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Li into the system of Goddard as modified by Zigmond to provide rotational and greater control over selection and other operations, for the user, than external button(s).

5. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goddard (6,684,240)** in view of **Zigmond et al (6,571,392)** as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of **Bell et al (5,937,038)**.

As to claims 17-18, Goddard as modified by Zigmond, teach where the host system provides volume level information to the universal which users the volume level information, but fail to explicitly show indication of the volume level on the display and to show a graphical representation of the volume level on the display.

However, note the **Bell** reference figures 1 and 3, discloses a set top unit which indicates the volume level and shows a graphical representation of the volume level on STB display 90 (col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 9 and col. 11, lines 25-49).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Bell into the system of Goddard as modified by Zigmond to provide a visual or graphical display of the volume level on the STB display to enable the user to visually see the volume level and adjust the volume accordingly.

6. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goddard** (6,684,240) in view of **Bell et al** (5,937,038) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of **Banker et al** (5,477,262).

As to claims 19-20, Goddard as modified by Bell, where the host provides a signal to the TV monitor, indicative of a graphical representation of the volume level to the interface.

However, note the **Banker** reference figures 3 and 6C discloses method and apparatus for providing an on-screen user interface for a subscription or cable television terminal (fig. 3 and col. 10, lines 61-64) which provides graphical representation of volume level to TV display 308 (figs. 6C and col. 19, lines 8-47).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Banker into the system of Goddard as modified Bell to provide a graphical representation of the volume on a large display to visual indicate to the user the volume level and also enable easier operation of the function keys or buttons of the remote controller.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Horiwitz et al (6,785,901) disclose altering locks on programming content.

Sgambati (5,606,443) discloses control circuit for entertainment system demonstration.

Kishi et al (5,506,578) disclose volume control of aural guidance of vehicle route guidance apparatus.

Wehmeyer et al (5,543,857) disclose graphical menu for a television receiver.

Bacon (5,054,071) disclose volume control for optimum television stereo separation.

Application/Control Number: 09/883,775 Page 8

Art Unit: 2617

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).**

Annan Q. Shang.

CHRIS KELLET SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600